

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments are to impart greater clarity to the claimed subject matter rather than to avoid the prior art.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above identified application. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-7, 9, 12-14, 16, 18 and 19-20 are rejected. Claims 8, 10-11, 15, 17 and 21 are objected to. Claims 1, 4, 7, 14 and 17 are amended.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 9, 14, 16-17 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,735,228 (Tsai).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization that the bias mode and modulation mode of Tsai, which are regulated at fixed values, can respectively anticipate the claimed adjustable bias mode and adjustable modulation mode as set forth by Applicant's claims.

However, being respectful of the Examiner's time, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 4, 7 and 14 to more particularly point out the claimed subject matter.

For example, Claim 1, as amended, presently sets forth "an adjustable bias mode, wherein a dynamic adjustment can be made to internally select any of a plurality of different bias currents." Applicant believes that the present amendment imparts sufficient clarity to the claimed "adjustable bias mode" to support Applicant's arguments that such an adjustable bias mode is not anticipated by Tsai.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Tsai does not disclose a first current signal having an adjustable bias mode and a modulation mode, but rather a current signal with a predetermined bias current, which is fixed. Of course, the current I_{out} of Tsai must be adjusted between the bias mode and the modulation mode to drive LD302 (Fig. 3) but that disclosure alone does not anticipate adjusting the bias mode of said first current signal as is set forth in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Similarly, Claim 4, as amended, presently sets forth “an adjustable modulation mode, wherein a dynamic adjustment can be made to internally select any of a plurality of different modulation currents.”

Tsai discloses that point A in Figure 2B is the predetermined current I_H corresponding to the high level of the gate voltage V_H (Fig. 2B; col. 4, lines 9-11) and that the comparison circuit 310 makes the output current I_{H1} equal to the predetermined current I_H provided by the current source 314 (Fig. 3; col. 4, lines 47-49). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Tsai does not disclose a first current signal having a bias mode and an adjustable modulation mode, but rather a current signal with a predetermined current I_H that is the sum of a predetermined bias current and a predetermined modulation current, both of which are fixed (Fig. 2A; col. 4, lines 3-5).

Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Claims 7 and 14, as amended, presently set forth “a bias control circuit to adjust the bias mode of said first current signal through one or more bias control inputs to internally select any of a plurality of different bias currents; and a modulation control circuit to adjust the modulation mode of said first current signal through one or more modulation control inputs to internally select any of a plurality of different modulation currents.”

As argued above, Applicant respectfully submits that Tsai does not anticipate the subject matter presently set forth in Claims 7 and 14.

Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 7 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

With regard to Claims 2, 5 and 19-20, for the same reason given above, Applicant respectfully submits that Tsai does not disclose the claimed subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 2, 5 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

The Office Action rejects Claims 3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsai in view of U.S. Patent 5,978,393 (Felderman) stating that it would have been obvious to combine the method of Tsai with an additional diode laser to increase transmission capabilities of the system and drive the laser with the converted

clock signal of Feldman to reduce the amount of noise introduced into the power supply by use of the modulation current.

The Office Action also rejects Claims 12-13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsai in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0101007 (Bozso) stating that it would have been obvious to combine the laser driver of Tsai with the CMOS circuit of Bozso in order to reduce power consumption when the gates are not being switched and in order to take advantage of the VCSEL's high coupling efficiency with optical fibers.

Applicant disagrees, but in light of the deficiencies of Tsai and being respectful of the Examiner's time, Applicant reserves the right to present arguments at a later time if the rejections are maintained.

Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining dependent claims are patentable at least by way of their dependence from an allowable independent claim.

With regard to Claims 17, Applicant has amended the claim per the Examiner's suggestion to impart greater clarity to the claimed subject matter.

In accordance with the above arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-21 are presently in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits the present claims for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Lawrence M. Mennemeier at (408) 765-2194.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0221 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 2, 2008

/Lawrence M. Mennemeier/

Lawrence M. Mennemeier

Reg. No. 51,003

INTEL CORPORATION
c/o INTELLEVATE LLP
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(408) 765-2194